DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 301 HE 033 055

AUTHOR	Fincher, Cameron
TITLE	The Influence of British and German Universities on the Historical Development of American Universities.
INSTITUTION	Georgia Univ., Athens. Inst. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	1996-07-01
NOTE	22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the European Association for Institutional Research (11th, Trier, Germany, August 27-30, 1989).
AVAILABLE FROM	Institute of Higher Education, Candler Hall, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602-1772; Tel: 706-542-3464.
PUB TYPE	Historical Materials (060) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators; College Faculty; *Colleges; Comparative Education; Educational History; Foreign Countries; *Higher Education; Institutional Administration; Institutional Characteristics; *International Education; Partnerships in Education; Professional Autonomy; Research Universities; School Business Relationship; United States History
IDENTIFIERS	*Germany; *Great Britain

ABSTRACT

This monograph provides a historical review of British and German influences on the development of American universities. The paper traces the foundations of modern universities to medieval institutions, such as the universities of Paris and Bologna, to such institutions as Oxford and Cambridge, and to German universities, which were founded as state institutions with the right of self-government. It also examines the concept of American "Wanderjahre"; the influence of German scholarship on American social science; British and German influences on administrative titles and faculty rank; and the post-World War II university, which is described as an interesting mixture of old and new and having partial solutions to problems of another day. A concluding section examines policy issues of common concern to American, British, German, and other continental universities, including: public perceptions of higher education as a public resource that must be brought to bear on complex societal and cultural problems; international cooperation in a global economy based on technological innovation; innovative partnerships among research universities, industry and business, and government; leadership and management education and/or development in multinational, intercultural, technologically oriented societies; and institutional effectiveness in education and training, research and development, public service, and other university responsibilities. (Contains 33 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 443 301

THE INFLUENCE OF BRITISH AND GERMAN UNIVERSITIES ON THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

by
Cameron Fincher

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. FINCHER
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

The University of Georgia
Institute of Higher Education
Athens, GA 30602-1772

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 033055

Foreword

This paper was originally presented at the 11th Annual Forum of the European Association for Institutional Research on August 27-30, 1989 at the University of Trier in Germany — and has been previously published in Edgar Frackman and Peter Maasen (Eds.), *Towards Excellence in European Higher Education in the Nineties* (Uitgeverij LEMMA B.V., Utrecht, 1992). It has been reprinted at the instigation of Dr. Erich Pohl, University of Heidelberg, a visiting professor at the Institute of Higher Education during the spring of 1996.

In the summer of 1989 no participants at the EAIR Forum anticipated the dramatic changes that took place within the next three years. There were many indications, nonetheless, that European higher education was undergoing rapid change and more than one paper addressed the implications of change for European universities. A major concern of EAIR participants was the quality of higher education as universities adapted to the challenge of the European Single Market for students. Unification was a term heard frequently, but participants were talking about the assimilation of higher education within the European Community. There was a concern also with further diversification as a means of accommodating students with different levels of preparation and educational objectives.

Internationalization of curricula was another phrase heard often — but in the context of the expected unification of European higher education and with expectations of significant change in curricular and instructional matters. In brief, the major themes of the 1989 EAIR Forum were indicative of concerns for the quality of higher education, the increasing importance of research, the uses of institutional research, and the management of institutions as they coped with new or different challenges.

Seven years after the EAIR Forum in Trier, American and European universities are under great pressure to deal with similar issues and to meet many of the same challenges. At the same time they are confronted with almost daily challenges to resolve complex issues that have followed from the social, economic, technological,

and organizational changes that have taken place since 1989. Research universities, in particular, are urged to seek organizational solutions to problems that are seldom defined adequately. They are told by critics that they must restructure programs and services, redefine institutional missions and program objectives, and reassign priorities in financing and resource allocation. Most of all, perhaps, universities are expected to accommodate, if not actively encourage, rapid organizational and technological change in a multinational economy and a global environment.

Since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Eastern European universities have offered American and Continental universities additional challenges and opportunities. Thus, to ensure constructive change and continuity in institutions of higher learning — historical, comparative, and developmental perspectives (and insights) have never been more relevant. In a highly competitive multinational economy there is an increasing need for cooperation among universities as there is between nations, societies, and cultures.

In the past, American universities have been particularly successful by being adaptive and responsive to the changing perceptions and expectations of their constituencies and the general public. Nonetheless, events since the summer of 1989 have underscored the areas of common concern that are identified in the following paper. Complex problems remained unsolved and the assistance of universities is surely needed. With or without accepting such challenges, American, British, and Continental universities are an important part of a multinational economy that is technologically driven in a global environment.

Cameron Fincher
Regents Professor
and Director
July 1, 1996

THE INFLUENCE OF BRITISH AND GERMAN UNIVERSITIES ON THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

The historical development of American universities has been influenced significantly by British and German universities. Higher education in the U.S. has often been interpreted as the superimposition of German graduate and professional education on English undergraduate colleges. The prominence of the Doctor of Philosophy degree (Ph.D.) as a "license to teach" in American universities, a pronounced emphasis on research and publication in scholarly journals, and the prestige that is often attached to scientific status in economics, political science, and sociology are indicative of Germanic influence. A continuing concern for the liberal arts as the core of undergraduate curricula, a commitment to students in the form of numerous services and scheduled activities, and the organization of our universities into separate colleges for purposes of teaching and learning are indicative of British heritages.

Other vestiges of German universities are seen in the continuance of lectures as the predominant mode of instruction in most college classrooms, in the requirement of research seminars for graduate students, and in the organization of research laboratories that bring students and mentors together in the quest for scientific truth. Lectures are no longer as formal as they once were, but they are still preferred by many students and faculty members. Seminars do not always deal with the frontiers of science, but they do stress the importance of method and technique in scientific inquiry. And although laboratories may again be places where students learn more from observation than from active participation, they are still the one place on most campuses where teaching and learning as conjoined efforts of students and faculty are most likely to take place.

But most important of all, German and British concepts of the *university* have influenced American institutions of higher education, their structure and functions, and their enviable reputations in the years since World War II. As an unexpected result of

European contributions and their adaptation to different conditions, American state universities now influence in various ways the continuing development of higher education in British and Continental institutions.

The Concept of a University

Writing in 1923, Charles H. Haskins regarded modern universities as lineal descendants of medieval institutions, especially the universities of Paris and Bologna. At various times between the years 1100 and 1200, new knowledge was added to the medieval curriculum of the *trivium* (rhetoric, grammar, and logic) and the *quadrivium* (geometry, arithmetic, music, and astronomy). That merger of new and old knowledge created the learned professions of theology, law, and medicine as they have been known since that time. Paris was pre-eminent as a school of theology, Bologna as a school of law, and Padua as a school of medicine.

Vestiges of the medieval university are seen in current faculties of theology, law, medicine, and philosophy (now arts and sciences). The *licentia docendi* was the earliest form of an academic degree, rectors (at Bologna) were the first university officials, and faculty members were first designated as masters (*magister*) or doctors. Haskins traces the development of universities from Bologna to Paris to Oxford, with German universities taking a different route. He writes:

> The essentials of university organization are clear and unmistakable, and they have been handed down in unbroken continuity. They have lasted more than seven hundred years — what form of government has lasted so long? (p. 35)

To Haskins it is ironical that the word *university* has nothing to do with the universe or with the universality of learning. The term denotes only the totality of a group and could pertain just as easily to barbers as to students. *College*, on the other hand, was the term chosen for the gilds of scholars, the masters who were excluded from the *universitas* of students. Originally residence halls, colleges became an established unit of academic life, and universities became examining and degree-conferring bodies at institutions such as Oxford and Cambridge.

"In America," according to Haskins, "the earliest institutions of higher learning reproduced the type of the contemporary English college at a time when the university in England was eclipsed by its constituent colleges . . . ." Later American colleges turned to continental universities for leadership and thus, "entered once more into the ancient heritage " (p. 30).

Friedrich Paulsen (1895) has described the different concept of *university* that arose in Germany. In contrast to British universities where general culture (the kind befitting gentlemen) was the ideal, German universities emphasized the unity of learned scholarship and the transfer of scholarly tools to other academic disciplines. The German university was wholly detached from secondary schools and promoted the centrality of its philosophy faculty among the traditional faculties of law, medicine, and theology. The unity of teaching and learning (by great scholars) and scientific/technical training for the learned callings of the ministry, bench and bar, and civil service were the German university's distinctive mission. Medical education was founded on science, jurisprudence on history, and theology on philosophy.

German universities were state institutions with the right of self-government. They did not develop gradually, as French and Italian universities did, but "were established after a scheme already extant and in operation" (p. 21). In brief, they were creations of the 19th century and were the outcomes of enlightened humanism, of independent and rationalistic philosophy, and of classical philology (for the purpose of general human culture). The University of Berlin (founded in 1809) was, to Paulsen, the Germanic revival of the ancient *studium generale* (where the universality of learning was honored without the restraints of national or state boundaries).

To quote Paulsen, German universities, "taken altogether, form a world by themselves" and:

> In particular, the tendency toward generalization of study, the philosophical sense which ever stands ready to turn details to good account in the service of the ultimate and highest insight, must always find its proper home in the faculty of philosophy. Herein might be found a particularly appropriate field for "public" lectures; to present to a wider

> circle of hearers, to the disciplines of all related branches of learning, whatever problems and results of general interest are included in a special subject. (p. 234)

At the time of Paulsen's writing, German higher education consisted of twenty-two universities with 28,328 students and 2,535 faculty members. Berlin was the largest university with 365 faculty members and 7,322 students. Medicine had the largest enrollments (8,684) and theology the smallest (4,705) with law and philosophy enrollments well over 7,000 each.

The American *Wanderjahre*

During the 19th century over 9,000 American students enrolled in German universities. Benjamin Franklin is believed to be the first American to visit a German university (Gottingen in 1766) and Edward Everett, George Ticknor, and George Bancroft were three of the first four Americans to earn degrees at the University of Gottingen. Each was influential in the adaptation of German methods and ideals to American needs. In Walter Metzger's (1955) judgment, the research university was "in large part a German contribution." Prior to the acceptance of research as a university responsibility, research methods were largely self-taught, libraries were mostly private, and laboratories were only workshops. And as Richard Hofstadter (1952) has suggested, American higher education was straitjacketed by notions of a classical education (for gentlemen only), fixed, or finite knowledge, and faculties of the human mind (the doctrine of formal discipline).

Metzger contends that German academic influence was more likely to reinforce native American tendencies toward change rather than initiate new departures. In effect, German doctoral degrees offered advantages to American academic careers because higher education in the U.S. was becoming more specialized, secular, and intellectually challenging. German influences were also evident in the rise of natural and/or experimental science, in the emphasis placed on careful observation and quantitative analysis, and in the researcher's dedication to the pursuit of knowledge.

Charles Franklin Thwing (1928), president of Western Reserve, estimates that almost 5,000 American students enrolled at the University of Berlin alone, at least 3,000 of them in philosophy.

Americans with German doctoral degrees were distinguishable by their intellectual habits, their independence and thoroughness in research (as well as their methods), and by their confidence in a personal contribution to human knowledge through scholarly research. The intellectual freedom to which Americans were exposed in German universities was a particularly valuable part of their education. And a proper relationship between breadth and depth of knowledge was to be expected of scholars in their respective fields.

Americans did not return from Germany, however, with increased appreciation of education's moral and religious worth. They did not learn humility in German universities, and they did not return with a deeper appreciation of good taste. In other words, they returned with disciplined, enriched intellectual resources but not with disciplined, enriched characters.

And yet, Americans were attracted to German universities (instead of English or French universities) for reasons such as the following: (a) Oxford and Cambridge were not interested in educating teachers, and they offered little in the way of advanced studies; (b) research and scholarship had different traditions in England, being more often an individual responsibility than an institutional commitment; and (c) higher education in England was essentially conservative *and* quite secondary to the social institutions of Family, State, and Church.

French universities were unappealing because: (d) the French did not revere education as Americans did; (e) libraries were not as well equipped; (f) graduate study was limited to the University of Paris, and (g) higher education in France was too serious and too extended, thereby requiring several years to earn a degree. Other features of American disdain for French universities were the receptivity of French students to American visitors and a national reputation of atheism.

The influence of national character upon the development of universities is an informative feature of Thwing's book. England and France were established as nations long before Germany and the United States. As a result, British and French universities were older and more traditional while German and American universities experienced vigorous growth and development in the 19th century. In each case national character and circumstances combined to form

distinctive universities. German universities offered advantages to American students that British and French universities did *not*. American students (Thwing tells us) were not as intellectually mature as German students. They were not as serious, and they were less ready temperamentally and intellectually "to wrestle" with German professors. Nonetheless, their native dispositions (of intellect and character) were more compatible with those of German students than British or French students at that time. In contrast to British and French universities, German libraries, laboratories, and lectures made lasting impressions on American students. British libraries were strong on the humanities but weak in the sciences. British tutorials, as a method of teaching, suffered in comparison to German lectures which Americans were free to attend or not to attend.

Indeed the appeal of German universities to American students is stated best by Paulsen:

> And, like the *Lehrfreiheit*, the *Lernfreiheit* in German universities is today as good as unlimited. The student selects for himself his instructors and his courses of study as well as his university and his profession; what lectures he will attend, in what exercises he shall take part, depends entirely on his will; there is no exertion of official influence, hardly as much as advice is given; and he is at liberty to choose to attend no lectures and to do no work. (p. 201)

Critics of German higher education, of course, are not reluctant in suggesting that German doctoral degrees were too dependent upon the student's ability to write and defend a dissertation. Others did not hesitate to label the German Ph.D. "an easy degree." Thwing's major criticism of German universities was their over-intellectualization and absence of insight into other methods or other minds. By focusing too closely on German progress and accomplishments, German universities were "in peril of being chauvinistic" (p. 186).

Scholarship and Science

Jurgen Herbst (1965) has written that the massive influence of German scholarship on American social science began with the founding of Johns Hopkins University in 1876 and continued until the outbreak of World War I. These were the years in which

German *Wissenschaft* influenced American philosophy, religion, history, economics, political science, and sociology. The German "historical school" viewed history as a body of knowledge requiring constant verification under conditions of new and changing environments. In adapting German "historicism" to their own cultural conditions, American universities imposed graduate and professional educational standards without lessening their appreciation of liberal learning. The liabilities of German scholarship, Herbst tells us, were notions that history alone had the scholarly tools to provide the answer to societal and cultural issues.

In the empirical study of human behavior, German influences on the development of American psychology were particularly strong. Edwin G. Boring's (1950) history of experimental psychology is an excellent source of information about the influence of German (and other Central European) universities on psychology as an experimental science. In the past Boring's classic has been required reading for psychology majors. Clearly evident in his discussion are the origins of experimental method in Germany and statistical analysis in England.

In physics, Daniel Kevles (1978) has written the fascinating story of the theorists and researchers who "unlocked" atomic energy. And an unusually informative history of the men who contributed to the development of the atomic bomb has been written by Richard Rhodes (1986). British and Continental influences are well-emphasized in both volumes.

Administrative Titles

American colleges were founded at a time when the administrative title of president was becoming more visible among heads of European and Continental universities. The influence of British and German universities is readily perceived, therefore, in the choice of administrative titles conferred by American colleges and universities.

In 1640 Henry Dunster became the first president of Harvard and thus the first head of a college in the English colonies. A quarter-century later William and Mary was founded and gave its head the title of president. William and Mary also used the titles of chancellor and rector. An appointed advisor to the president was known as the chancellor while the presiding officer of the

institution's board of visitors was called the rector. Sometime later Yale gave the title of rector to its highest ranking official because rector was a less pretentious title than president. About the same time the University of Pennsylvania used the administrative title of provost, a title that was later used by Columbia University as a superior title to president.

The University of Georgia, the first chartered state university in the United States, preferred the title of president for 60 years, then changed to chancellor, and then changed back to president when the title of chancellor was adopted by a statewide governing board for its highest ranking official.

The confusions of administrative titles are easily attributed to American perceptions of British and European universities. At Oxford the heads of four colleges were called president but the most common title was that of master. Scottish universities used the title of rector, occasionally dignifying the title further by raising it to Lord Rector. No doubt American notions of democracy precluded the widespread use of titles such as master and rector. It is surprizing that the title of chancellor has been used as frequently as it has in state-supported colleges and universities. It is not surprizing that the title is used inconsistently. Some statewide systems of higher education in the United States use the title of chancellor for their chief executive officer and appoint presidents as heads of separate institutions. Other statewide systems invert the order and make campus chancellors subservient to system presidents.

Some administrative titles, such as warden and proctor, have been shunned by American universities, but an aura of enchantment is often attached to the title of dean. Although American universities have many "non-academic" deanships, the title of dean still conveys the notion of academic authority and prestige in ways that other administrative titles do not.

Faculty Rank

Other vestiges of influence can be seen in the adoption of professorial rank for American faculty members. Prestige, if not status, is associated with the rank of full professor and a great portion of faculty concerns in American universities deal with promotion and the granting of academic tenure. The ranks of ordinary professor (42%), extraordinary professor (21%), and *Privatdozent* (28%) in

Paulsen's German universities (in 1894) were distributed in remarkable similarity to the ranks of full professor, associate professor, and assistant professor in many American universities (in 1989).

In American higher education the Ph.D. is often referred to as "a union card" thus sustaining many of its associations with a "license to teach." Research universities, in particular, quickly confer the rank of assistant professor on faculty members who have earned a doctorate. Ascent to the ranks of associate and full professor are conditioned by time-in-rank (at lower levels), teaching and research specialties, and (most important of all) publications in scholarly journals and books. Despite the great emphasis placed on the evaluation of teaching effectiveness in the past 20 years, teaching competencies are of lesser importance in the promotion of faculty members who publish books and journal articles.

In summary of British and German influences on the historical development of American state universities, emphasis should be placed on the concept of a research university that advances the frontiers of knowledge and then uses that knowledge in service to state and society. Methods of teaching and learning, academic organization and governance, and other variants of medieval heritages are important but none of these have shaped American state universities in the same way as concepts of science and scholarship *and* the placement of such responsibilities in universities. As Dael Wolfle (1972) has pointed out, a distinctive feature of American higher education is the extent to which scientific research is regarded as the province of universities. American universities have been influenced profoundly by German universities in this respect, and scientific research is now more heavily concentrated in the former than in the latter.

In their emulation of German research and scholarship, however, American universities have not lost their allegiance to British concepts of liberal learning, undergraduate education, academic governance, and collegiate organization. Student protests in the 1960s and the "demise" of *en loco parentis* did *not* displace the countless student services and organized activities that American universities lavishly provide their students. And departmentalized colleges continue to be the organizational structure under which faculty members are appointed to teach and in which students enroll for degree programs.

American universities have added major functions all their own. Public service *and* the land-grant tradition in American state universities are essential features and vital forces in institutional missions. Another unique contribution is the American university's allegiance to lay control, or external governing boards of private citizens in which institutional authority is vested. Related to this feature is the elaborate administrative structure of American universities (and colleges) with seven, eight, or more vice presidents and numerous deans and directors positioned between presidents and academic department heads.

Thus — in adapting British and German concepts and/or ideals, American universities have added innovations of their own and thereby produced profound differences while preserving interesting similarities. It all speaks well of cultural exchange, adaptation, and diffusion.

The Contemporary University

In contrast to the learned volumes that depict the emergence of modern universities, there are few definitive histories of the many changes that have taken place in the post-WWII years of growth, expansion, protest, and readjustment. The contemporary university is very much a creature of postwar adjustments, and it reflects earlier efforts to accommodate change, to adapt to new challenges, and to solve societal problems that are intense enough to attract national attention. What we see on most university campuses are interesting mixtures of the old and the new — *and* partial solutions to problems of another day.

Joseph Ben-David (1977) has written that American, British, and Continental universities now serve as models throughout the civilized world. And Burton Clark (1983) has given a much needed cross-national perspective. These volumes emphasize, however, the national or cultural differences that persist among European universities, and common problems — such as the adoption of modern management techniques, increased centralization and government regulations, demands for accountability thru assessment and evaluation, and broader participation in institutional governance — have not been addressed in concerted or sustained fashion (See Fincher, 1988). In many respects, the common problems of American,

British, and German universities are indicative of the areas in which reciprocal influences are most likely — areas of common concern in which effective resolutions of complex policy issues are sought.

Tony Becher (1987) has edited a volume on the many changes in British higher education. Over 500 institutions now serve at least 886,000 students (figures that contrast sharply with the 31 universities and 188 colleges that served 333,000 students in 1963). With change has come an "unprecedented political interest" on the part of Parliament, modified funding policies and control, demands for accountability, and various curricular shifts. Change is evident at all levels of higher education in Great Britain and in all areas of management, finance, and national policy.

William Birch (1988) has defined the challenge to British higher education in a monograph published by the Society for Research into Higher Education. He advocates a new, expanded academic ethic that will not separate theory from academic values and the uses of knowledge in solving societal problems. In the past an academic ethic has been based on academic achievement and excellence — and not on research directed to significant problems in the world of practical affairs. As a result, the public image of higher education has been weakened, along with its autonomy and its claim on public resources.

Daniel Fallon (1980) has described the German university as a heroic ideal in conflict with the modern world. He writes that the Berlin model of German higher education was revived in 1945 (and lived until 1960) but could not thrive in the post-WWII world. He describes the passing of institutes under a lone professor and the demise thereby of professorial authority. German universities are now departmentalized along disciplinary lines, with elected chairmen, academic committees, and three-year appointments for young academics. They are now headed by full-time administrators who were elected by the university and approved by the state for four-year renewal terms of office. From 1950 to 1973 (the year in which Fallon wrote), German universities had experienced a 400 percent growth rate with enrollments rising from 116,900 to 485,500 students.

Having influenced in many ways the development of American universities, British and German universities should be in a better position to appreciate the complex issues that now confront

national universities in North America and Western Europe. American universities, with their long tradition of cultural adaptation and innovation, should be in an excellent position to provide the leadership needed for multinational cooperation. In any event, the effective resolution of many common policy issues would seem to call for better cooperation on the part of all universities. In turn, cross-cultural cooperation calls for the kind of historical consciousness that is evidenced in the contemporary university's intellectual and cultural heritage.

Areas of Common Concern

American, British, and German universities have many common problems (in the 1980s) that have accompanied unprecedented growth and increased access to higher education. As educational costs have risen and as central government has borne an increasing share of those costs, policy decisions have been made at higher levels and institutional autonomy has eroded. In such ways conflict between governmental authority and institutional autonomy now seems inevitable. And irrespective of the appealing undertones of assessment and accountability, the risks involved in state control (within an ensuing loss of independence in academic policies and standards) are real.

Among the many policy issues confronting American, British, German, and other continental universities are:

1. *Public perceptions of higher and/or tertiary education as public resources that must be brought to bear on complex societal and cultural problems;* many civic, business, and industrial leaders look upon contemporary universities as resources to be used in behalf of the public interest. Basic research and technological innovation are increasingly regarded as public services that universities could provide if not bound by academic traditions. Perceptions of university faculties as expert problem-solvers are not as widespread in the 1990s as in the 1960s but such perceptions (and expectations) do persist. In addition to knowledge, universities distribute advantages and benefits that increasing numbers of people want to share. Other societal problems for which universities should provide solutions

are: (a) the education of college graduates who are intellectually competent, politically enlightened, technologically proficient, culturally literate, and economically productive; (b) more diversified and interchangeable career routes from secondary schools to postsecondary institutions (whatever their specific functions); and (c) the education of young adults who seek access to educational opportunity but who are educationally, socially, and economically disadvantaged.

2. *International cooperation in a global economy based on technological innovation;* the economic, technological, and cultural problems of contemporary universities are indicative of the external pressures that rapid technological innovation and intense international competition bring to bear on traditional and/or conservative social institutions. Corporate take-overs, mergers, and leveraged buy-outs recall an era of "rugged individualism." Other signs point to an increased concern with corporate and public ethics, inter-institutional cooperation, and more harmonious government-business relations.

3. *Innovative and mutually satisfying partnerships among research graduate universities, industry and business (in a post-industrial society), and government (national, state or province, and local);* in some respects, three-way partnerships consisting of government, business, and higher education are further demands on university resources, talents, and expertise. As such, they are accommodations (on the university's part) to economic and political pressures, and they may call into play the historian von Ranke's antagonistic principles of "freedom and necessity." Universities are expected to contribute fully through basic research and technological innovations that will enhance national competitiveness in a global economy (See Powers, Powers, Betz, and Aslanian, 1988 for a discussion of cooperative strategies). In doing so, universities are seldom equal partners and they must expend great energy in defense of academic traditions that leave university faculty free to inquire, to study, to interpret, and to criticize. When universities are no longer free to do so, they have become politicized. Such has been a threat to major research universities for many years. When universities become politicized, their performance and organizational

behavior are increasingly bureaucratic. In the U.S. the threat of costly litigation and the uncertainty of court rulings has reduced many university administrators to petty bureaucrats who "process" decisions, appeals, and counterproposals without offering leadership or personal commitment. We may question that such leaders are capable of making creative or constructive responses in the arenas of international competition.

4. *Leadership and management education and/or development in multinational, intercultural technologically-oriented societies;* no challenge to contemporary universities is more important than the education, training, and development of business, civic, university, and other public leaders who can respond to technological, multinational, and intercultural issues (See Porter and McKibbin, 1988 for a discussion of management education). Studies of leadership have emphasized the changing needs of nations, corporations, and universities. These studies suggest that leaders with vision, charisma, and exceptional competencies will be needed to meet the challenges of the 21st century; the sources of such leadership are unknown. Universities, in particular, have long been reluctant to accept responsibility for the education and development of their own leaders — despite continuing claims that they educate the leaders of other organizations and institutions.

5. *Institutional effectiveness in education and training, research and development, public service, and other university responsibilities;* this challenge includes more effective organizational arrangements *among institutions,* and more effective organization *within* institutions. The organizational capabilities of contemporary universities must be turned to the challenge of re-organizing themselves. The same competencies and expertise must be directed to organizational and institutional purposes, programs, services, and outcomes. In brief, an extensive concern with outcomes assessment and institutional accreditation has intensified the search for criteria of institutional effectiveness.

In conclusion, this paper has given a brief historical review of British and German influences on the development of American

universities. The paper includes a gratuitous leap from the 19th century to the latter half of the 20th century, but it has identified (hurriedly) several areas in which national universities in western civilization are challenged to cope with changing public expectations and policy issues. Interinstitutional cooperation in dealing successfully with those expectations and issues are dependent upon the intellectual and cultural values that have created the contemporary university. The most challenging policy issues are embedded in sociocultural change and technological innovation. For effective resolution of these issues, the leadership of contemporary universities must involve *awareness* of historical origins and experiences, *sensitivity* to cultural differences and similarities, *cooperation* with other sociocultural institutions, and *sophistication* in matters of technological innovation. It's an awesome challenge.

REFERENCES

Ben-David, Joseph. *Centers of Learning: Britain, France, Germany, United States.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977.

Burn, Barbara B. *Higher Education in Nine Countries.* New York: McGraw Hill, 1971.

Clark, Burton R. *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

Becher, Tony. *British Higher Education.* London: Allen & Unwin, 1987.

Birch, William. *The Challenge to Higher Education: Reconciling Responsibilities to Scholarship and to Society.* Milton Keynes, England: Society for Research into Higher Education, 1988.

Bok, Derek. *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Social Responsibilities of the Modern University.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Boring, Edwin. *A History of Experimental Psychology.* Second Edition. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1950.

Fallon, Daniel. *The German University: A Heroic Ideal in Conflict with the Modern World.* Boulder: Colorado Associated University Press, 1980.

Fincher, Cameron. "University-Government Relations and Academic Organization." In L.C.J. Goedegebuure, and V.L. Meek, (Eds.), *Change in Higher Education: The Non-University Sector.* Enschede: Center for the Study of Higher Education Policy Studies, University of Twente, 1988.

Giamatti, A. Bartlett. *The University and the Public Interest.* New York: Atheneum, 1981.

Haskins, Charles H. *The Rise of Universities.* New York: Henry Holt, 1923.

Hearnden, Arthur. *Education in the Two Germanies.* Boulder: Westview Press, 1976.

Herbst, Jurgen. *The German Historical School in American Scholarship.* New York: Cornell University Press, 1965.

Hofstadter, Richard, and Hardy, C. DeWitt. *The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.

Hofstadter, Richard, and Metzger, Walter P. *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.

Kerr, Clark. *The Uses of the University.* Third Edition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Kertesy, S.D. (Ed.). *The Task of Universities in a Changing World.* Notre Dame: N.D. University Press, 1971.

Kevles, Daniel J. *The Physicists: The History of a Scientific Community in Modern America.* New York: Knopf, 1978.

Lilge, Frederic. *The Abuse of Learning: The Failure of the German University.* New York: Macmillan, 1948.

Mansbridge, Albert. *The Older Universities of England.* London: Longmans, Green, 1923.

Moodie, Graeme C. *Power and Authority in British Universities.* London: Allen and Unwin, 1974.

Paulsen, Friedrich. *The German Universities: Their Character and Historical Development.* New York: Macmillan, 1895.

Porter, Lyman W. and McKibbin, Lawrence. *Management Education and Development: Drift or Thrust into the 21st Century?* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1988.

Powers, David R., Powers, Mary F., Betz, Frederick, and Aslanian, Carol B. *Higher Education in Partnership with Industry: Opportunities and Strategies for Training, Research, and Economic Development.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988.

Rhodes, Richard. *The Making of the Atomic Bomb.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978.

Shils, E. *The Academic Ethic.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Thwing, Charles Franklin. *The American and the German University: One Hundred Years of History.* New York: Macmillan, 1928.

Ulich, Robert. *The Education of Nations: A Comparison in Historical Perspective.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Wolfle, Dael. *The Home of Science: The Role of the University.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

ADDENDA

Fincher, Cameron. *Planning for Quality and Efficiency in Higher Education.* Presented at the 6th European AIR Forum in Brussels and published in Charles H. Belanger (Ed.) *Beyond Retrenchment: Planning for Quality and Efficiency.* 1984.

_____. *Aministrative and Organizational Structures in American, British, and Continental Universities.* Athens,GA: Institute of Higher Education, The University of Georgia, 1991.

_____. *Cooperative Strategies in Administrative Leadership.* Athens, GA: Institute of Higher Education, The University of Georgia, 1992.

_____. "The Idea of the University in the 21st Century: An American Perspective." *British Journal of Education Studies,* 1993, *41*(1), 26-45.

Purpose and Functions

The Institute of Higher Education is a service, instructional, and research agency of the University of Georgia. Established in 1964, the Institute cooperates with other agencies and institutions in the development of higher education. Programs and services help prepare professionally trained personnel in higher education, assist other colleges and universities in numerous ways, and study the organizational and functional processes of institutions and programs of higher education.

Publications

The Institute publishes a series of occasional papers, monographs, and newsletters dealing with selected topics in higher education. The general purpose of Institute publications is to inform administrators and faculty members of recent trends and developments in areas such as administration, curriculum planning, program evaluation, professional development, and teaching effectiveness. The specific intent may be to report research findings, to interpret general trends or recent events, or to suggest new lines of inquiry into various problems.

Additional copies of this publication may be obtained from:

Institute of Higher Education
Candler Hall
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602-1772
706/542-3464